REMARKS

Claims 12 and 14 have been amended. Claims 10, 12, 14, and 16 remain in the application. These amendments are believed to place the claims in *prima facie* condition for allowance. These amendments are necessary and not earlier presented to address Examiner's concerns and further clarify and distinguish Applicants' invention over art made of record but not relied upon. Further examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is hereby requested.

In Section 2 of the Final Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14 under 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors , at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that there is no description in the specification as originally filed of doping the first region having a first conductivity type and the second region having second conductivity type with the same dopant concentration other than doping the first region 20 and second region 22, wherein both regions have the same conductivity type such as N with the same dopant concentration. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As stated on page 6, beginning on line 1, Fig. 1 illustrates an integrated circuit with low voltage CMOS transistors and a high voltage LDMOS transistor. The first region 20 is shown as a N- doped well with a P type transistor. The second region 22 is shown as a N- doped well with lateral diffusion MOS (LDMOS) with a P+ implant thereby creating N type LDMOS transistor (See Fig 3N – ref. char 6 and Fig. 5. of Mei for evidence of knowledge of skill in the art for architecture of LDMOS transistor. The third region 24 is shown as P- doped well with an N type transistor. Thus, the first region 20 has a first conductivity type (P) transistor, the third region 24 has a second conductivity type (N) transistor, and the second region 22 has a second conductivity type (N) transistor as claimed and described by the inventor (see page 6, lines 1-19 and page 8, line 21 to page 10 line 21. Thus, as the Examiner states, both the first and second regions are doped with the same N- doping, the amount of which is chosen to set the

threshold voltage of the P type transistor and the breakdown voltage of the HV N type transistor in the second region 24. Applicants have amended claims 12 and 14 to explicitly state this desired result. The applicants are not claiming different doping of each well but a single dopant for both wells whereby each well will have a different conductivity type transistor ultimately. However, by controlling the doping level of the first and second regions, a subsequent implant doping to set the threshold voltage of the first conductivity type (P) transistor in the first well is avoided. Additional doping steps (other than the Vt implant) known to those of skill in the art are performed to finish creating the transistors. However, the claims 12 and 14 use the transition phrasing "comprising" and include only those steps necessary to succinctly claim and define Applicants' invention over the prior art. Accordingly, the Applicants are claiming what was described in the invention and thus the rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph is in error and its withdrawal is respectfully requested.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14 under 35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Applicants have amended claims 12 and 14 as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this rejection under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph is respectfully requested.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been reviewed, but is no more pertinent to Applicants' invention than the cited references for the reasons given above.

Applicants believe their claims as amended are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02. Accordingly, claims 10, 12, 14, and 16 are deemed to be in prima facie condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541)715-4197
Fax: (541)715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,
Z. Chen et al.
By: Timothy F. Myers
Timothy F. Myers
Patent Attorney
Registration No. 42,919